

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

PETER DIPIETRO,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, et al.,

Defendants.

Civ. No. 1:14-cv-352-NLH-AMD

OPINION and ORDER

APPEARANCES:

PETER DIPIETRO
495 SOUTH BLUEBELL ROAD
VINELAND, NJ 08360

Appearing *pro se*

DANIEL JAMES KELLY
STATE OF NEW JERSEY
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
HUGHES JUSTICE COMPLEX
25 MARKET STREET
P.O. BOX 117
TRENTON, NJ 08625

On behalf of State of New Jersey

MATTHEW PAUL MADDEN
MADDEN & MADDEN
108 KINGS HIGHWAY EAST, SUITE 200
P.O. BOX 210
HADDONFIELD, NJ 08033-0389

On behalf of Municipal Township of Franklinville; Municipal
Township of Franklinville, Building Code Enforcement;
Steven Rickershauser; and Ed Smith

JOHN C. EASTLACK, JR.
WEIR & PARTNERS LLP

215 Fries Mill Road
2nd Floor
Turnersville, NJ 08012

On behalf of Franklin Joint Municipal Court; John Doe,
private prosecutor; Judge Joan Sorbello Adams; and Thomas
M. North

HILLMAN, District Judge

WHEREAS, on August 31, 2023, Plaintiff filed a motion entitled "Motion for Application of Payment in this Court Registry Investment System (CRIS)" and "Motion for Withdrawal of Funds from the Registry of the Court" in this case as well as in four other closed cases: Peter DiPietro v. Landis Title Co., No. 11-5110; Peter DiPietro v. Gloucester County Sherriff's Dept., No. 11-5878; Peter DiPietro v. Morisky, et al., No. 12-2338; and Peter DiPietro v. State of New Jersey, No. 19-17014 seeking the return of either \$10 million or \$10 billion dollars from the Court's register;¹ and

WHEREAS, Plaintiff also filed to reinstate two of these closed cases: Peter DiPietro v. Landis Title Co., No. 11-5110 and Peter DiPietro v. Morisky, et al., No. 12-2338; and

WHEREAS, Plaintiff's "Motion for Application of Payment in this Court Registry Investment System (CRIS)" and "Motion for Withdrawal of Funds from the Registry of the Court" is patently frivolous on its face in that it provides no legal analysis or

¹ The motion seeks the return of "\$10,000,000,000.00 TEN MILLION DOLLARS plus any accrued interest." (ECF 28).

any allegations of a good-faith belief that such an enormous amount of money was ever deposited into the Court Registry or would otherwise be owed to him by the Clerk or the Court; nor, given the nature of this matter and a review of the docket, is there any objective reason why such funds would have been deposited during the litigation of this matter or evidence that such a deposit or deposits were ever made;

THEREFORE, it is on this 17th day of October, 2023,

ORDERED that the Clerk shall reopen the case and shall make a new and separate docket entry reading "CIVIL CASE REOPENED"; and it is further

ORDERED that the Motion for Application of Payment in this Court Registry Investment System (CRIS)" and or Withdrawal of Funds", (ECF 28) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk shall re-close the file and make a new and separate docket entry reading "CIVIL CASE TERMINATED"; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this Opinion and Order on Plaintiff by regular mail.

At Camden, New Jersey

s/ Noel L. Hillman
NOEL L. HILLMAN, U.S.D.J.